UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,450	02/23/2004	Martin Zilliacus	P4257US00	8280

11764 7590 06/15/2011

Ditthavong Mori & Steiner, P.C.
918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
JAKOVAC, RYAN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/15/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dcpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/784,450	ZILLIACUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan Jakovac	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 April 2011*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,7-19,22-27,29-34,36,38,39,42-49 and 52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 7-19, 22-27, 29-34, 36, 38-39, 42-49, and 52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. This action is in response to communications filed 04/29/2011. Claims 1-3, 7-19, 22-27, 29-34, 36, 38-39, 42-49, and 52 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 04/29/2011 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Upon consideration new grounds of rejection are provided below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. **Claims 36, 38-39, 42-49 are rejected** under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed towards nonstatutory subject matter.

5. The claim(s) are drawn towards a computer program product comprising a "computer readable storage medium". Applying the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification and taking into the account the meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary still in the art (MPEP 2111), the claim as a whole covers both transitory and non-transitory media. A transitory media does not fall into any of the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. **Claims 1-3, 7-9, 22-27, 36, 38-39, and 44 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Outlook 97 (hereinafter *Outlook*) in view of U.S. 6,944,272 to *Thomas*, in view of U.S. 2005/0114453 to Hardt, and further in view of U.S. 6,912,398 to *Domnitz*.

Regarding independent claim 1,

Outlook teaches a method comprising:

> directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub, wherein the generic-recipient message comprises a message sent to a group or community address (pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.);
>
> determining predefined attributes of the message, wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (pg. 86, 157-159, sender of the message is determined as messages are routed through the server.);
>
> directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients (Outlook, pg. 157-159, email distributed based on distribution group membership.)

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

> determining a type of communication medium of the message;
>
> determining one or more recipients for the message based at least in part upon the determined type;

However, *Thomas* discloses:

> determining a type of communication medium of the message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.),
>
> determining one or more recipients for the message based at least in part upon the determined type (col. 9 table 2, messages are selected based on type (e.g. fax, email, voice Col. 9:36-40, selected messages are forwarded to other subscribers.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Outlook* to include the teachings of *Thomas* in would be in order to administer messages according to traits of the message (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and *Thomas* do not expressly disclose:

> determining one or more recipients for the message further based at least in part upon the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with stored information related to potential recipients

However, *Hardt* discloses:

> determining one or more recipients for the message further based at least in part upon the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with stored information related to potential recipients ([0022], [0068], the message is routed to recipients based on analysis of the title or body of the message. Rule based processing is used in accordance with recipient addresses and user account information.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of *Hardt* with the teachings of *Outlook* and *Thomas* in order to route messages based on attributes of the message such as the title or the body to recipients with a specialization in a particular area (Hardt, [0068].).

Outlook, *Thomas*, and *Hardt* do not expressly disclose:

> directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message; and
>
> dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub

However, *Domnitz* discloses:

> directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message (col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.), and

dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub (col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (Domnitz, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding independent claim 22.

Outlook discloses:

an apparatus comprising at least one processor and at least one memory storing computer program code (pg. 86, mail server),

wherein the at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, cause the apparatus to at least:

direct receipt of a generic-recipient message from one or more communication networks wherein the generic-recipient message comprises a message sent to a group or community address (pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.);

determine predefined attributes of the generic-recipient message, wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (pg. 86, 157-159, sender of the message is determined as messages are routed through the server.);

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

determining a type of communication medium of the message;

determining one or more recipients for the message based at least in part upon the determined type;

However, *Thomas* discloses:

> determining a type of communication medium of the message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.),
>
> determining one or more recipients for the message based at least in part upon the determined type (col. 9 table 2, messages are selected based on type (e.g. fax, email, voice Col. 9:36-40, selected messages are forwarded to other subscribers.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Outlook* to include the teachings of *Thomas* in would be in order to administer messages according to traits of the message (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and *Thomas* do not expressly disclose:

> determining one or more recipients for the message further based at least in part upon the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with stored information related to potential recipients

However, *Hardt* discloses:

> determining one or more recipients for the message further based at least in part upon the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with stored information related to potential recipients ([0022], [0068], the message is routed to recipients based on analysis of the title or body of the message. Rule based processing is used in accordance with recipient addresses and user account information.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of *Hardt* with the teachings of *Outlook* and *Thomas* in order to route messages based on attributes of the message such as the title or the body to recipients with a specialization in a particular area (*Hardt*, [0068].).

Outlook, *Thomas*, and *Hardt* do not expressly disclose:

directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message; and

dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub

However, *Domnitz* discloses:

directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message (col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.), and

dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub (col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (*Domnitz*, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding independent claim 36,

Outlook discloses a computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium having computer-readable program instructions embodied in the medium, the computer-readable program instructions comprising:

instructions configured for directing storage of information related to potential message recipients (pg. 86);

instructions configured for directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub and determining predefined attributes associated with the generic-recipient message,

wherein the generic-recipient message comprises a message sent to a group or community address (pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.),

wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (pg. 86, 157-159, sender of the message is determined as messages are routed through the server.);

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

instructions configured for determining a type of communication medium of the message;

instructions configured for determining one or more recipients for the message based at least in part upon the determined type;

However, *Thomas* discloses:

instructions configured for determining a type of communication medium of the message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.),

instructions configured for determining one or more recipients for the message based at least in part upon the determined type (col. 9 table 2, messages are selected based on type (e.g. fax, email, voice Col. 9:36-40, selected messages are forwarded to other subscribers.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Outlook* to include the teachings of *Thomas* in would be in order to administer messages according to traits of the message (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and *Thomas* do not expressly disclose:

instructions configured for determining one or more recipients for the message further based at least in part upon the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with stored information related to potential recipients

However, *Hardt* discloses:

> instructions configured for determining one or more recipients for the message further based at least in part upon the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with stored information related to potential recipients ([0022], [0068], the message is routed to recipients based on analysis of the title or body of the message. Rule based processing is used in accordance with recipient addresses and user account information.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of *Hardt* with the teachings of *Outlook* and *Thomas* in order to route messages based on attributes of the message such as the title or the body to recipients with a specialization in a particular area (Hardt, [0068].).

Outlook, *Thomas*, and *Hardt* do not expressly disclose:

> instructions configured for directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message; and
>
> dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub

However, *Domnitz* discloses:

> instructions configured for directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message (col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.), and
>
> dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub (col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (*Domnitz*, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding dependent claim 25, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of claim 22.

Outlook discloses:

> wherein the at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, cause the apparatus to direct dispatch of the message by directing dispatch of the message to one or more determined recipients via a communication network (pg. 86, mail server)

Regarding dependent claim 26, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of claim 25.

Outlook discloses:

> wherein the communication network includes either a data network, a Short Message Service (SMS) network, a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) network and or a telephony network (pg. 86, data network)

Regarding dependent claim 2, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 1,

Outlook discloses:

> wherein directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub further comprises directing receipt of a generic-recipient message, that includes either a Short Message Service (SMS) message, a Multimedia Message Service, (MMS) message, an electronic mail (email) message or voice message (pg. 55, 97, email).

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

> wherein determining a type communication medium of the message comprises determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message

However, *Thomas* discloses:

> wherein determining a type communication medium of the message comprises determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of *Thomas* in order to provide type identification for messages (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Thomas does not expressly disclose Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) message. However, *Thomas* expressly discloses:

> The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner. The date/time field 306 is used to indicate when the message was received, and the sender field 308 is used to identify who sent the message (col. 7:64-67)

Therefore since *Thomas* discloses the common formats of fax, email, voicemail, and page, it would have been obvious to include the common formats of Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) messages with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Hardt*.

Regarding dependent claim 9, *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of Claim 1.

Outlook discloses:

wherein directing dispatch of the message to one or more recipients further comprises directing transmission of the message to one or more recipients via a communication medium that includes either short-range wireless communication, Internet communication, SMS communication, or MMS communication (pg. 86, 157-159)

Regarding dependent claim 38, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the computer program product of claim 36.

Outlook discloses:

> wherein instructions configured for directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub further comprises instructions configured for directing receipt of a generic-recipient message, that includes either a Short Message Service (SMS) message, a Multimedia Message Service, (MMS) message, an electronic mail (email) message or voice message (pg. 55, 97, email).

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

> wherein instructions configured for determining a type communication medium of the message comprises instructions configured for determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message

However, *Thomas* discloses:

> wherein instructions configured for determining a type communication medium of the message comprises instructions configured for determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of *Thomas* in order to provide type identification for messages (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Thomas does not expressly disclose Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) message. However, *Thomas* expressly discloses:

> The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner. The date/time field 306 is used to indicate when the message was received, and the sender field 308 is used to identify who sent the message (col. 7:64-67)

Therefore since *Thomas* discloses the common formats of fax, email, voicemail, and page, it would have been obvious to include Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) messages with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Hardt*.

Regarding dependent claim 44, *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the computer program produce of claim 36.

Outlook discloses:

> wherein instructions configured for directing dispatch of the message to one or more recipients further comprises instructions configured for directing transmission of the message to one or more recipients via a communication medium that includes either short-range wireless communication, Internet communication, SMS communication, or MMS communication (pg. 86, 157-159)

Regarding dependent claim 7, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 1.

Domnitz teaches:

> wherein directing dispatch of the message to one or more recipients further comprises directing display of the message on a display (fig. 1-2, col. 4:45-51, abstract, col. 8:10-20.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (*Domnitz*, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding dependent claim 8, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 7.

Domnitz teaches:

> wherein the display is associated with the radio frequency (RF) identifier (col. 5:7:-11, 30-50, fig. 1-2, displays associated with radio frequency identifiers, laptop, pda.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine wherein the display is associated with the radio frequency (RF) identifier as taught by *Domnitz* with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Hardt* to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (*Domnitz*, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Regarding dependent claim 27, *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of Claim 22.

Domnitz teaches:

> further comprising a display associated with the apparatus that is configured to, under the direction of the at least one memory and stored computer program code, display a message associated with the Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers (col. 5:7:-11, 30-50, fig. 1-2, displays associated with radio frequency identifiers, laptop, pda; col. 4:45-51, col. 8:10-20.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine wherein the display is associated with the radio frequency (RF) identifier as taught by *Domnitz* with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Hardt* to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (*Domnitz*, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Regarding dependent claim 3, and 39, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 1 and computer program product of claim 36.

Domnitz teaches:

> wherein directing receipt of a generic-recipient message at a network hub further comprises directing receipt of a message by a wireless network hub (fig. 1.).

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include receiving a generic-recipient message at a *wireless* network hub with the teachings of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* since incorporating wireless technology amounts to applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results (e.g. wireless transmission of messages). See MPEP 2141.

Regarding dependent claim 23, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of claim 22.

Domnitz discloses:

> wherein the at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, cause the apparatus to direct dispatch of the message by directing dispatch of the message to one or more determined recipients via lower power RF (Domnitz, fig. 1.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* in order to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (*Domnitz*, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Regarding dependent claim 24, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches claim 22.

Domnitz discloses:

> wherein the at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor cause the apparatus to direct dispatch of the message directing dispatch of the message to one or more determined recipients by directing dispatch of the message to one or more determined recipients via a digital cellular network (fig. 3. See also col. 7:30-46.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* in order to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (*Domnitz*, abstract, 5:30-50.).

10. **Claims 10-19, 29-34, 45-49, and 52 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Domnitz*, and further in view of U.S. 2005/0149622 to Kirkland et al (hereinafter *Kirkland*).

Regarding independent claim 10,

Outlook teaches a method for prioritizing a generic recipient message at a network hub, the method comprising:

> directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub, wherein the generic-recipient message is comprises a message sent to a group or community address (pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.);
>
> determining predefined attributes of the message, wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (pg. 86, 157-159, sender of the message is determined as messages are routed through the server.);

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

> determining a type of communication medium of the message

However, *Thomas* discloses

> determining a type of communication medium of the message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Outlook* to include the teachings of *Thomas* in would be in order to administer messages according to traits of the message (*Thomas*, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and *Thomas* do not expressly disclose:

> determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority.

However, *Kirkland* discloses:

> determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority (abstract, [0009-0010], priority level of a message is determined according to the subject of the message and the messages is delivered and displayed to the recipient according to the priority level.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message if a determination is made that the message has priority as taught by *Kirkland* with the method of *Outlook* and *Thomas* in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7.).

Outlook, *Thomas*, and *Kirkland* do not expressly disclose:

> determining to dispatch the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the network hub.

However, *Domnitz* discloses:

> determining to dispatch the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the network hub (col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (*Domnitz*, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding independent claim 29,

Outlook teaches an apparatus comprising at least one processor and at least one memory storing computer program code (pg. 86), wherein the at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, cause the apparatus to at least:

> direct receipt of a generic-recipient message from one or more communication networks wherein the generic-recipient message comprises a message sent to a group or community address (pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.);
>
> determine predefined attributes of the received generic-recipient message, wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (pg. 86, 157-159);

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

> determining a type of communication medium of the message

However, *Thomas* discloses

> determining a type of communication medium of the message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Outlook* to include the teachings of *Thomas* in would be in order to administer messages according to traits of the message (*Thomas*, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and *Thomas* do not expressly disclose:

> determine whether the message has priority based at least in part on the determined type and on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre-stored priority information;

However, *Kirkland* discloses:

> determine whether the message has priority based at least in part on the determined type and on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre-stored priority information (abstract, [0009-0010], priority level of a message is determined according to the subject of the message and the messages is delivered and displayed to the recipient according to the priority level.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message if a determination is made that the message has priority as taught by *Kirkland* with the method of *Outlook* and *Thomas* in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7.).

Outlook, *Thomas*, and *Kirkland* do not expressly disclose:

> determine to dispatch the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tar or a radio frequency tar reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the one or more communication networks

However, *Dommitz* discloses:

> determine to dispatch the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tar or a radio frequency tar reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the one or more

communication networks (col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (*Domnitz*, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding independent claim 45,

Outlook discloses a computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium having computer-readable program instructions embodied in the medium, the computer-readable program instructions comprising:

instructions configured for directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub and determining predefined attributes associated with the generic-recipient message, wherein the generic-recipient message comprises a message sent to a group or community address (pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.),

wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (pg. 86, 157-159);

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

instructions configured for determining a type of communication medium of the message

However, *Thomas* discloses

instructions configured for determining a type of communication medium of the message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Outlook* to include the teachings of *Thomas* in would be in order to administer messages according to traits of the message (*Thomas*, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and *Thomas* do not expressly disclose:

> instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message priority;
>
> instructions configured for determining whether the genetic-recipient message has priority based at least in part on the determined type and on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes associated with the generic-recipient message to the stored information related to message priority;

However, *Kirkland* discloses:

> instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message priority (abstract, [0009-0010]);
>
> instructions configured for determining whether the genetic-recipient message has priority based at least in part on the determined type and on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes associated with the generic-recipient message to the stored information related to message priority (abstract, [0009-0010], priority level of a message is determined according to the subject of the message and the messages is delivered and displayed to the recipient according to the priority level.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message if a determination is made that the message has priority as taught by *Kirkland* with the method of *Outlook* and *Thomas* in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7.).

Outlook, *Thomas*, and *Kirkland* do not expressly disclose:

> instructions configured for dispatching the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the network hub.

However, *Domnitz* discloses:

> instructions configured for dispatching the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the network hub (col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (*Domnitz*, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding dependent claim 18, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 10,

Outlook discloses:

> wherein directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub further comprises directing receipt of a generic-recipient message, that includes either a Short Message Service (SMS) message, a Multimedia Message Service, (MMS) message, an electronic mail (email) message or voice message (pg. 55, 97, email).

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

> wherein determining a type communication medium of the message comprises determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message

However, *Thomas* discloses:

> wherein determining a type communication medium of the message comprises determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of *Thomas* in order to provide type identification for messages (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Thomas does not expressly disclose Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) message. However, *Thomas* expressly discloses:

> The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner. The date/time field 306 is used to indicate when the message was received, and the sender field 308 is used to identify who sent the message (col. 7:64-67)

Therefore since *Thomas* discloses the common formats of fax, email, voicemail, and page, it would have been obvious to include the common formats of Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) messages with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Hardt*.

Regarding dependent claim 48, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the computer program product of claim 45.

Outlook discloses:

> wherein the instructions configured for directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub further comprises instructions configured for directing receipt of a generic-recipient message, that includes either a Short Message Service (SMS) message, a Multimedia Message Service, (MMS) message, an electronic mail (email) message or voice message (pg. 55, 97, email).

Outlook does not expressly disclose:

> wherein instructions configured for determining a type communication medium of the message comprises determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message

However, *Thomas* discloses:

> wherein instructions configured for determining a type communication medium of the message comprises determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice message (col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of *Thomas* in order to provide type identification for messages (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Thomas does not expressly disclose Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) message. However, *Thomas* expressly discloses:

> The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner. The date/time field 306 is used to indicate when the message was received, and the sender field 308 is used to identify who sent the message (col. 7:64-67)

Therefore since *Thomas* discloses the common formats of fax, email, voicemail, and page, it would have been obvious to include the common formats of Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) messages with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Hardt*.

Regarding dependent claims 19 and 49, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 10 and computer program product of claim 45.

Domnitz teaches:

> wherein directing receipt of a generic-recipient message at a network hub further comprises directing receipt of a message by a wireless network hub (fig. 1.).

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include receiving a generic-recipient message at a *wireless* network hub with the teachings of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* since incorporating wireless technology amounts to applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results (e.g. wireless transmission of messages). See MPEP 2141.

Regarding dependent claim 11, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 10.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein the step of determining whether the message has priority based on the predefined attributes further comprises determining whether the message has display priority based on the predefined attributes (abstract, [0009-0010], fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Kirkland* with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7.).

Regarding dependent claim 12, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of Claim 11.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority further comprises prioritizing the display of the message when a determination is made that the message has display priority (abstract. See also, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Kirkland* with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7.).

Regarding dependent claim 13, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of Claim 12.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein prioritizing the display of the message when a determination is made that the message has display priority further comprises directing display of displaying the message in a prominent position on a display associated with the hub (abstract, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Domnitz* in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 14, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of Claim 10.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein determining whether the message has priority based on the predefined attributes further comprises determining whether the message has dispatch priority based on the predefined attributes (abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 15, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of Claim 13.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority further comprises prioritizing the dispatch of the message when a determination is made that the message has dispatch priority (abstract, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 16, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of Claim 15.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein prioritizing the dispatch of the message when a determination is made that the message has dispatch priority further comprises prioritizing the communication medium used to dispatch the message when a determination is made that the message has communication medium dispatch priority (abstract, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with *Outlook*, *Thomas*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 17, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of claim 15.

Outlook teaches:

> wherein the step of prioritizing the dispatch of the message if a determination is made that the message has dispatch priority further comprises the step of prioritizing the time of dispatch of the message if a determination is made that the message has time dispatch priority (Outlook, pg. 97, 100, timed delivery options.).

Regarding dependent claim 30, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of Claim 29.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein the processor is further configured to at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to determine predefined attributes of the received generic-recipient message and compare the predefined attributes to pre-stored display priority information to determine if the received message requires display prioritization (abstract, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 31, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of Claim 30.

Kirkland discloses:

> further comprising a display associated with the apparatus that is configured to, under the direction of the at least one memory and stored computer program code, display message identifiers to one or more recipients (abstract, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content as well as to display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 32, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of Claim 30.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein the processor is further configured to at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to provide for display prioritization to be chosen from the group consisting of displaying prioritized messages first in a list of messages, displaying prioritized messages in a new viewable window and displaying prioritized messages in a highlighted form (abstract. See also, [0051], fig. 6, 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content as well as to display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 33, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of Claim 29.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein the processor is further configured to at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to determine predefined attributes of the received generic-recipient message and compare the predefined attributes to pre-stored dispatch priority information to determine if the received message requires dispatch prioritization (abstract. See also, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content as well as to display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 34, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the apparatus of Claim 33.

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein the processor is further configured to at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to provide for dispatch prioritization to be chosen from the group consisting of prioritizing the time at which messages will be dispatched, prioritizing the communication medium used to dispatch messages and prioritizing the recipients of the dispatched messages (abstract. See also, fig. 8, [0051].).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base

on subject or content as well as to display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 46, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the computer program product of Claim 45

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein the instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message priority further comprise instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message display priority, and wherein the instructions configured for determining whether the generic-recipient message has priority further comprise instructions configured for determining whether the generic-recipient message has display priority by comparing the predefined attributes associated with the generic-recipient message to the stored information related to message display priority (abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content as well as to display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 47, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the computer program product of Claim 45

Kirkland discloses:

> wherein the instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message priority further comprise instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message dispatch priority, and wherein the instructions configured for determining whether the message has priority further comprise instructions configured for determining whether the message has dispatch priority by comparing the predefined attributes associated with the messages to the stored information related to message dispatch priority (abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to determine message priority base on subject or content as well as to display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 52, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* teaches the method of Claim 10.

Domnitz discloses:

> further comprising displaying of the message on a display responsive to the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader being placed in proximity to the network hub (col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (*Domnitz*, col. 3:24-37.).

11. **Claim 42-43 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, *Domnitz*, and *Kirkland*.

Regarding dependent claim 42, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, and *Domnitz* teaches the computer program product of Claim 36.

Kirkland discloses:

wherein the instructions configured for directing dispatch of dispatching the message to one or more recipients further comprise instructions configured for directing display of displaying the message on a display associated with the network hub (abstract, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, *Domnitz*, and *Kirkland* in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (*Kirkland*, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding dependent claim 43, the combination of *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, *Domnitz*, and *Kirkland* teaches the computer program product of claim 42.

Domnitz teaches:

wherein the instructions configured for directing display of the message on a display associated with the network hub further comprises fourth instructions configured for directing display of the message, which is associated with the Radio Frequency (RF) identifier, on a display associated with the network hub, wherein the recipient Radio Frequency identifier is associated with the radio frequency tag reader (fig. 1, email, PDA, pc, or cell phone display messages associated with a radio frequency identifier, col. 5:7:-11, 30-50, fig. 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine *Outlook*, *Thomas*, *Hardt*, *Kirkland*, and *Domnitz* in order to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (*Domnitz*, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Jakovac whose telephone number is (571)270-5003. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ryan Jakovac/

Examiner, Art Unit 2445